

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. NIE-0003-US 7921 10/051,156 01/22/2002 Jorge Abel Groiso EXAMINER 28970 11/26/2004 PRIDDY, MICHAEL B **SHAW PITTMAN** IP GROUP PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT 1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD **SUITE 1300** 3732 MCLEAN, VA 22102 DATE MAILED: 11/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/051,156	GROISO, JORGE ABEL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael B Priddy	3732
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 A	<u>ugust 2004</u> .	
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is		
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) 1-6,21 and 22 is/are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>4-6 and 22</u> is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are rejected.		
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>21</u> is/are objected to.	*	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.	
Application Papers		8
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.	
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		, (DTO 412)
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	
·		

Art Unit: 3732

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jobe (U.S. 5,787,713). Jobe teaches a bone staple 70 capable of correcting bone deficiencies by controlling the growth of the epiphyseal plate, the staple comprising: a shape memory material body comprising a cross bar 74 and at least two legs 72 extending from the cross bar. The cross bar 74 is resiliently deformable between an initial orientation and an insertion orientation upon application of a force to the cross bar 74. The legs 72 are oriented at an angle relative to the opposite leg 72 when the body portion is in the initial orientation and the legs 72 are substantially parallel when the body portion is moved to the insertion orientation for insertion of the legs 72 into tissue. The leg portions at least partially return to the initial orientation when the force applied to the cross bar 74 is released such that the legs 72 anchor the staple 70 to the tissue.

Art Unit: 3732

As shown in Fig. 16, the legs may be "initially directed outwardly" such that they diverge.

The language "for use in the method of claim 4" amounts to intended use. It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

Concerning the language of claim 2, the embodiment of Fig. 16 clearly shows each leg at an angle of greater than 90° relative to the cross bar 74. Furthermore, cross bar 74 extends beyond a corner joint between the cross bar 74 and the legs 72 forming a curved shoulder means (Exhibit A) for abutting the bone and the cross bar defines an arc shape.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jobe.

Jobe discloses the claimed invention except for the staple body being made of nitinol. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

Art Unit: 3732

was made construct the staple body of nitinol since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 21 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 4-6 and 22 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 08/25/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the cross bar of the present invention, however, has been constructed and designed to arrest and control the growth plate while the legs are constructed for exerting an expansion force into the bone far from the periphery thereof) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

In response to Applicant's argument that "Jobe neither discloses nor suggests the use and design of a staple for controlling the epiphyseal plate and for accommodating the growth of the bone in order to prevent the staple from being

Art Unit: 3732

expelled by the bone during growth", a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In the instant case, the Examiner sees no reason why the device of Jobe wouldn't be capable of performing the intended use. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael B. Priddy whose telephone number is (571) 272-4717. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 10 a.m. - 6 p.m..

Art Unit: 3732

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on (571) 272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

Michael B. Priddy

November 17, 2004

John J. Wilson Primary Examiner Page 6